

REMARKS

Claims 1-32 were rejected. Claims 1-7, 9, 11-18, 20-22, and 28-30 have been amended, claims 8, 10, 23, 25, and 27 have been cancelled, and claim 33 has been added. Thus, claims 1-7, 9, 11-22, 24, 26, and 28-33 are pending.

Claims 1, 5-7, 9, and 11-17 have been amended to remove the terms "therapeutically effective" or "therapeutically effective dose." Claims 3, 11, and 21 have been amended to depend from claims 2, 1, and 20, respectively. Claim 5 has been amended to remove the limitation of implanting the formulation in proximity to, or within, a tumor. Claim 9 has been amended to remove the medical access device limitation. Claims 16 and 17 have been amended to include "further comprising" language and to remove the phrase "said attenuated measles virus", providing consistency with claim 1. Claim 18 has been amended to remove the article "the" modifying the terms "expression" and "replication." Claim 20 has been amended to remove the term "and combinations thereof" and to add the term "cells" in conjunction with each cancer in the claimed Markush group, providing consistency with claim 1. Claim 21 has been amended to indicate that the cancer cells are myeloma cells, providing consistency with claim 20. Claim 22 has been amended to indicate that the myeloma cells are non-Hodgkin's lymphoma cells, providing consistency with claim 21. Claim 28 has been amended to correct the spelling of the word "strain." Claims 29 and 30 have been amended to substitute the article "the" for "a" in modifying the words "Moraten" and "Edmonston."

Claim 1 has been amended to recite a method for reducing the number of viable cancer cells in a mammal. Support for this amendment can be found throughout Applicants' originally filed specification. See, e.g., page 6, lines 19-22 and page 8, line 27 through page 9, line 4. Claim 2 has been amended to indicate that the virus is administered directly to a cancer cell in the mammal. Support for this amendment can be found throughout Applicants' originally filed specification. See, e.g., page 15, lines 12-13. Claims 6, 7, 9, and 11 have been amended to indicate that it is the attenuated measles virus formulation that is being provided or administered. Support for this amendment can be found throughout Applicants' originally filed specification. See, e.g., page 15, lines 12-26. Claim 29 has been amended to indicate that the attenuated measles virus comprises either the Moraten strain or the Moraten Berne strain. Support for this

amendment can be found throughout Applicants' originally filed specification. See, e.g., page 10, lines 20-26. Claim 30 has been amended to indicate that the attenuated measles virus comprises the Edmonston strain, the Edmonston Zagreb strain, or the Edmonston Enders strain. Support for this amendment can be found throughout Applicants' originally filed specification. See, e.g., page 11, lines 2-17. Thus, no new matter was added.

In light of amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-7, 9, 11-22, 24, 26, and 28-33.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected claims 1-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner asserted that the claims are indefinite because it is not clear what is encompassed within a "therapeutically effective amount." The Examiner also rejected claim 5, stating "in proximity to" is understood to mean within 1-2 cm of a tumor according to Applicants' specification. In addition, the Examiner rejected claim 9, indicating that the specification fails to disclose what is encompassed within the recited medical access device. Further, the Examiner rejected claims 10-15, alleging that the specification fails to disclose the metes and bounds of the term "about." The Examiner also rejected claim 20, indicating that it is not clear what is encompassed within the term "claimed combinations thereof." Moreover, the Examiner rejected claims 25 and 27, asserting that the claim scope is uncertain because a trademark or trade name cannot be used properly to identify any particular material or product. The Examiner also rejected claim 28, alleging that it is not clear if the terms Edmonston Zagreb, Edmonston Enders, and Moraten Berna denote single or dual viral antigens. The Examiner rejected claims 29 and 30, asserting that the recitation of "a Moraten strain" and "a Edmonston strain" are indefinite because the article "a" connotes plural strains that the specification does not teach. Claims 29 and 30 were also held indefinite for the recitation of "non-human cells."

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's positions stated above. Nevertheless, to further prosecution of rejected claims 1, 5-17, 20, 23, 25, 27, and 29-30, Applicants have made the following amendments. Claims 1, 5-7, 9, and 11-17 have been

amended to remove the terms "therapeutically effective" or "therapeutically effective dose." In addition, claims 8, 10, and 23, which also contain the terms "therapeutically effective dose" or "therapeutically effective amount," have been cancelled. Claim 5 has been amended to remove the limitation of implanting the formulation in proximity to, or within, a tumor. Claim 9 has been amended to remove the medical access device limitation. Claim 20 has been amended to remove the term "and combinations thereof." Claims 25 and 27 have been cancelled, thus obviating the Examiner's rejection of those claims. Claim 29 has been amended to indicate that the attenuated measles virus comprises either the Moraten strain or the Moraten Berne strain. Claim 30 has been amended to indicate that the attenuated measles virus comprises the Edmonston strain, the Edmonston Zagreb strain, or the Edmonston Enders strain.

With regard to claims 10-15, the Merriam-Webster Collegiate Dictionary defines the term "about" as "reasonably close to" or "in the vicinity of." Hence, the term "about 10^5 pfu" encompasses values that are reasonably close to 10^5 pfu. Such values are readily ascertainable as being within the typical error parameters associated with titering techniques that were standard at the time Applicants' invention was made. Consequently, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been able to determine whether the number of pfu in a given sample is, for example, about 10^5 . Thus, the term "about" does not render claims 10-15 indefinite.

With regard to claim 28, the recited strains are well known in the art as each representing a single virus strain. In addition, Applicants' specification as originally filed discloses individual strains of measles virus: Edmonston Zagreb strain is disclosed on page 11, lines 16-17; the Edmonston Enders strain is disclosed on page 11, lines 2-3; the Moraten strain is disclosed on page 10, lines 20-25; and the Moraten Berne strain is disclosed on page 10, lines 25-26. Thus, the recitation of strains in claim 28 is clear in light of Applicants' originally filed specification.

With regard to claims 29 and 30, in contrast to the Examiner's assertion, Applicants' originally filed specification teaches multiple non-human cell lines that "include, but are not limited to chick embryos, quail embryos, duck embryos, and dog and bovine kidney cells." See, e.g., page 14, lines 15-17. A person having ordinary skill in the art reading Applicants' specification would have understood the term "non-human cells" and how to determine which non-human cells can be used for serial passage of virus. Thus, the recitation of "non-human cells" is definite in light of Applicants' specification as originally filed.

In light of the remarks and amendments above, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 1-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The Examiner asserted that the instant disclosure fails to meet the enablement requirement for the following reasons: (1) the claims encompass the highly experimental and unpredictable field of *in vivo* cancer therapy for humans; (2) the state of the prior art and the predictability or lack thereof in the art is such that animal models are not necessarily predictive of the efficacy of virotherapy in humans due to the differences in specificity of the virus for human and animal cells of other species; and (3) the specification lacks guidance regarding administering attenuated measles virus to human cancer patients so as to achieve a therapeutic effect on symptomatology or actual disease progression, and all of the working examples are drawn to experimental results in the mouse xenograft model. Based on these assertions, the Examiner alleged that it would require undue experimentation by one of skill in the art to be able to practice the claimed invention.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's positions described above. First, present claim 1 recites a method for reducing the number of viable cancer cells in a mammal, comprising administering attenuated measles virus to the mammal under conditions wherein the number of viable cancer cells in the mammal is reduced. Applicants' specification as originally filed fully enables a person having ordinary skill in the art to practice the claimed method. Applicants provide working examples teaching methods for reducing the number of viable cancer cells in a mammal by administering attenuated measles virus in a Non-Hodgkin's Lymphoma model (see Example 1), and in non-lymphatic cancer models including human melanoma, human breast carcinoma, and human glial tumors (see Example 2). In fact, the working example disclosed in Example 3 teaches that attenuated measles virus, when administered intravenously to mice harboring human-derived tumors, caused complete regression of those tumors, thus obviating the need for targeting the virus to a tumor. It is noted that a person having ordinary skill in the art would have appreciated that the complete regression

of a tumor is an example of reducing the number of viable cancer cells. Although the working examples are in mouse xenograft models, the methods taught are effective to reduce the number of viable cancer cells as evidenced by the breadth of cancers tested and the multiple routes of administration used.

Second, although the Examiner has cited references questioning the feasibility of using animal models to predict efficacy in other mammals, the Examiner has failed to show how these references specifically relate to the feasibility of reducing the number of viable cancer cells in a mammal using the presently claimed invention, especially in light of Applicants' working examples. Despite questions regarding the feasibility of animal and xenograft models raised by others, Applicants have successfully used these models to show that administration of attenuated measles virus to a mammal reduces the number of viable cancer cells.

Third, Applicants teach dosages and intervals that are sufficient to reduce the number of viable cancer cells in a mammal (see Examples 1-3). Applicants also teach how to adjust the dosage and/or interval on a patient-by-patient basis to achieve a desired effect (see, e.g., page 16, lines 3-24), how to formulate attenuated measles virus for administration (see, e.g., page 16, line 25 through page 18, line 3), and how to monitor the course of therapy (see, e.g., page 18, lines 4-19). Thus, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have had sufficient guidance regarding administering attenuated measles virus to any mammal, including a human, to reduce the number of viable cancer cells.

In light of the above, Applicants submit that a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been able to make and/or use the presently claimed invention based on Applicants originally filed specification. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Bateman et al. (Gene Therapy 6, Suppl 1:S6, Abstract 24, October 1999) or Linardakis et al. (Gene Therapy 6, Suppl 1:S4, Abstract 13, October 1999). Specifically, the Examiner asserted that either Bateman et al. or Linardakis et al. teach that the fusogenic membrane glycoproteins (FMGs) of measles virus can be administered to a mammal to reduce

tumor growth and selectively kill cancer cells. The Examiner alleged that it would have been *prima facie* obvious to have administered an attenuated measles virus as a convenient method of administering the FMGs taught by either Bateman et al. or Linardakis et al.

Applicants respectfully disagree. Present claim 1 has been amended to recite a method for reducing the number of viable cancer cells in a mammal by administering attenuated measles virus to the mammal under conditions wherein the number of viable cancer cells in the mammal is reduced. In contrast to the Examiner's assertions, neither Bateman et al. nor Linardakis et al. teaches or suggests Applicants' claimed invention. Bateman et al. discuss the cytotoxic activity of FMGs *in vitro* when delivered via plasmids, and that transplantable murine tumor cell lines engineered to express FMGs are effective vaccines against parental cell tumor challenge *in vivo*. Likewise, Linardakis et al. discuss the cytotoxic effects of FMGs in a range of tumor cells *in vitro*. The discussion in Bateman et al. about using murine tumor cell lines as vaccines to elicit an immune response says nothing about the ability of whole measles virus to reduce the number of viable cancer cells in a mammal. Likewise, the macromolecular interactions between and among FMGs and other components in the membranes of transgenic cultured cells are, as is evident to any person having ordinary skill in the art, far different from those present in the arrays of specifically oriented multi-protein aggregates constituting a whole virus. As such, the observed cytotoxic effects of FMGs expressed in tumor cells *in vitro* have little, if any, relevance to whole measles virus. Applicants' originally filed specification, on the other hand, discloses the surprising finding that attenuated whole measles virus, when administered to a mammal, prevents tumor growth (see, e.g., page 22), decreases the rate of tumor progression (see, e.g., page 23 and Figures 2B and C), and causes tumor regression (see, e.g., page 23 and Figure 2A). Thus, the cited references, alone or in combination, fail to suggest that a person having ordinary skill in the art should carry out the presently claimed invention. In fact, the Examiner appears to be relying on impermissible hindsight using Applicants' disclosure as a template to reconstruct the presently claimed invention from the cited references.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-3 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

The Examiner rejected claims 1-25 and 28-32 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bateman et al. (Cancer Research 60:1492-1497, March 15, 2000; of record in Paper #5; hereinafter Bateman 2000) in view of Weibel et al. (Archives of Disease in Childhood 48:532-536, 1973). The Examiner characterized Bateman 2000 as teaching that measles virus kills target cells by inducing fusion, and that this activity can be exploited therapeutically to kill tumor cells. The Examiner also characterized Bateman 2000 as teaching an exemplary cancer (i.e., melanoma) for therapeutic reduction. The Examiner asserted that Weibel et al. teach commercially available preparations of attenuated measles virus as a monovalent preparation of the Moraten line of measles virus (ATTENUVAX) or as a trivalent preparation of measles, mumps, and rubella (MMR). The Examiner alleged that it would have been *prima facie* obvious to have used one of the vaccine compositions taught by Weibel et al. as a safe, convenient, and effective means of administering the measles fusogenic glycoproteins taught by Bateman 2000 to control cancer growth in a patient.

Applicants respectfully disagree because a proper *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established. A proper *prima facie* case of obviousness requires, *inter alia*, that the cited prior art references provide a reasonable expectation of success. The combination of Bateman 2000 and Weibel et al. fails to provide a reasonable expectation of success in practicing the presently claimed invention. In particular, the cited combination fails to provide a reasonable expectation of success in delivering fusogenic membrane glycoproteins (FMGs) *in vivo* using attenuated measles virus to achieve a reduction in the number of viable cancer cells in a mammal. Bateman 2000 indicates that cells transfected *in vitro* with plasmid DNA encoding measles virus FMGs F and H undergo cell fusion and death. At no point, however, does Bateman 2000 teach or suggest that whole measles virus can be used to kill tumor cells. Further, Bateman 2000 fails to provide any suggestion for using measles virus to deliver FMGs to target cells *in vivo*. As discussed above, the molecular biology of a whole virus is far removed from the molecular biology of a mammalian cell engineered to express FMGs in its plasma membrane.

Weibel et al. does not remedy the deficiencies of Bateman 2000. Weibel et al. discusses clinical studies involving a combined single dose measles-mumps vaccine. At no point does Weibel et al. teach or suggest that whole measles virus can be used to induce tumor cell fusion and death.

In addition, although Bateman 2000 indicates FMGs could be exploited therapeutically to kill tumor cells, neither Bateman 2000 nor Weibel et al. provides a reasonable expectation of success that administering attenuated measles virus *in vivo* would have the same effect on tumor cells as administering plasmids to tumor cells *in vitro* in order to express FMGs. Again, Applicants' specification teaches that attenuated measles virus, when administered to a mammal, prevents tumor growth, causes tumor regression, and decreases the rate of tumor progression.

When establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on Applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). As stated above, the combination of Bateman 2000 and Weibel et al. fails to provide a reasonable expectation of success in practicing the presently claimed invention. Thus, it is only with impermissible hindsight using Applicants' disclosure as a template that one can reconstruct the claimed invention from the combination of Bateman 2000 and Weibel et al.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-25 and 28-32 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

The Examiner rejected claims 1-17, 20-24, 26-28, and 30-32 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bateman 2000 in view of Usonis et al. (Pediatr Infect Dis J, 18:42-48, 1999). The Examiner asserted that Usonis et al. teach two vaccine compositions combining measles, mumps, and rubella live attenuated viruses: (1) the MMR II vaccine comprising the Enders Edmonston measles strain, and (2) the Priorix vaccine comprising the Schwartz measles strain. The Examiner alleged that it would have been *prima facie* obvious to have used one of the vaccine compositions taught by Usonis et al. as a safe, convenient, and effective means of administering the measles fusogenic glycoproteins taught by Bateman 2000 to control cancer growth in a patient.

Applicants respectfully disagree because a proper *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established. The deficiencies of Bateman 2000 has been discussed above. Usonis et al. do not remedy the deficiencies of Bateman 2000. In as much as Usonis et al. discuss the use of vaccine compositions including attenuated measles virus, Usonis et al. can be considered similar to Weibel et al. in subject matter. Thus, the same non-obviousness rationale presented rebutting

the combination of Bateman 2000 and Weibel et al. can be applied to the combination of Bateman 2000 and Usonis et al. In particular, the cited combination of Bateman 2000 and Usonis et al. fails to provide a reasonable expectation of success that administering attenuated measles virus *in vivo* would have the same effect on tumor cells as administering plasmids to tumor cells *in vitro* in order to express FMGs. It is only with impermissible hindsight using Applicants' disclosure as a template that one can reconstruct the claimed invention from the combination of Bateman 2000 and Usonis et al.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-17, 20-24, 26-28, and 30-32 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

The Examiner rejected claims 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Bateman et al. in view of Weibel et al. or Bateman et al. in view of Usonis et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Duprex et al. (Journal of Virology 73/11:9568-9575, November 1999). The Examiner's characterizations of Bateman et al., Weibel et al., and Usonis et al. have been presented above. The Examiner asserted Duprex et al. teach that measles virus can be recombinantly made to express the marker polypeptide green fluorescent protein (GFP), and that such can be used to monitor cellular infection of the measles virus *in vivo*. The Examiner alleged that it would have been *prima facie* obvious to genetically modify the attenuated measles virus taught by either Weibel et al. or Usonis et al. to express GFP as taught by Duprex et al. in order to monitor tumor cell infection and destruction *in vivo*.

Applicants respectfully disagree. Bateman et al., Weibel et al., and Usonis et al. have been discussed above. Similar to the combination of Bateman 2000 and Weibel et al. or Bateman 2000 and Usonis et al., the combination of Bateman et al. and Weibel et al. or Bateman et al. and Usonis et al. does not teach or suggest a method for reducing the number of viable cancer cells in a mammal by administering attenuated measles virus under conditions wherein the number of viable cancer cells in the mammal is reduced, as recited in Applicants' independent claim 1. In particular, the cited combination of Bateman 2000 and Usonis et al. fails to provide a reasonable expectation of success that administering attenuated measles virus *in vivo* would have the same effect on tumor cells as administering plasmids to tumor cells *in vitro* in order to express FMGs.

With regard to dependent claims 18 and 19, the Duprex et al. reference does not remedy the deficiencies of Bateman et al. and Weibel et al. or Bateman et al. and Usonis et al. Duprex et al. discuss the infection of human astrocytoma cells *in vitro* with a recombinant measles virus expressing GFP. Duprex et al., however, fail to teach or suggest the limitation embodied in Applicants' claim 18, namely that the expression of the marker polypeptide (e.g., GFP) correlates with the replication of the attenuated measles virus administered to the mammal. Thus, the cited combination of references does not render Applicants' claims obvious.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

The Examiner rejected claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either of Galanis et al. (Gene Therapy 6, Suppl 1:S7, Abstract 28, October 1999) or Russell et al. (Proceedings of the American Association for Cancer Research 41:259, Abstract #1648, March 2000) in view of either Weibel et al. or Usonis et al. The Examiner asserted that either Galanis et al. or Russell et al. teach a method of treating gliomas comprising administering the two fusogenic membrane glycoproteins of measles virus to a patient so as to reduce the number of cancer cells. The Examiner also indicated that either Weibel et al. or Usonis et al. teach commercially available preparations of attenuated measles virus which are routinely used as vaccine preparations. The Examiner concluded that it would have been obvious to have administered an attenuated measles virus preparation described by either Weibel et al. or Usonis et al. as a convenient and safe means of administering measles fusion membrane glycoproteins for a therapy of glioma as described by either of Galanis et al. or Russell et al.

Applicants respectfully disagree. The deficiencies of Weibel et al. and Usonis et al. have been presented above. In as much as Galanis et al. or Russell et al. discuss the use of plasmids encoding viral FMGs to kill cells, Galanis et al. or Russell et al. can be considered similar to Bateman 2000 in subject matter. Thus, the same non-obviousness rationale presented rebutting the combination of Bateman 2000 and Weibel et al. or Bateman 2000 and Usonis et al. can be applied to the combination of either Galanis et al. or Russell et al. with either Weibel et al. or Usonis et al. In particular, the cited combinations fail to provide a reasonable expectation of success that administering attenuated measles virus *in vivo* would have the same effect on glioma

Applicant : Stephen J. Russell et al.
Serial No. : 09/668,196
Filed : September 22, 2000
Page : 14

Attorney's Docket No.: 07039-293001

cells as administering plasmids to glioma cells *in vitro* in order to express FMGs. Thus, it is only with impermissible hindsight using Applicants' disclosure as a template that one can reconstruct the claimed invention from the combinations of either Galanis et al. or Russell et al. with either Weibel et al. or Usonis et al.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).


CONCLUSION

Attached is a marked-up version of the changes being made by the current amendments.

Applicants submit that the claims are in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. Enclosed is a check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 28, 2002



J. Patrick Finn III, Ph.D.
Reg. No. 44,109

Fish & Richardson P.C., P.A.
60 South Sixth Street
Suite 3300
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 335-5070
Facsimile: (612) 288-9696

Version with markings to show changes made

In the claims:

Claims 8, 10, 23, 25, and 27 have been cancelled.

Claims 1-7, 9, 11-18, 20-22, and 28-30 have been amended as follows:

1. (Amended) A method for reducing the number of viable cancer cells in a mammal [of treating cancer], comprising administering [a therapeutically effective dose of] attenuated measles virus to said mammal under conditions wherein [a patient so as to reduce] the number of viable cancer cells in said mammal is reduced [the patient].
2. (Amended) The method of claim 1, wherein said attenuated measles virus is administered directly to a cancer cell in said mammal [said cancer cells].
3. (Amended) The method of claim 2 [1], wherein said cancer cell[s are] is part of a tumor.
4. (Amended) The method of claim 3, wherein said attenuated measles virus is injected directlyly[ed] into said tumor.
5. (Amended) The method of claim 4, wherein said [therapeutically effective dose of] attenuated measles virus is provided in a formulation comprising an excipient[, and said formulation is implanted in proximity to, or within, said tumor].
6. (Amended) The method of claim 5, wherein said attenuated measles virus formulation [therapeutically effective dose] is provided continuously to said mammal [patient].
7. (Amended) The method of claim 5, wherein said attenuated measles virus formulation [therapeutically effective dose] is provided in pulses to said mammal [patient].

9. (Amended) The method of claim 1, wherein said attenuated measles virus [therapeutically effective dose] is administered systemically to said mammal [a patient intravenously to a patient through a medical access device].
11. (Amended) The method of [any of] claim[s] 1[-9], wherein said attenuated measles virus is administered at a [therapeutically effective] dose [is] greater than about 10^3 pfu.
12. (Amended) The method of claim 11, wherein said [therapeutically effective] dose is about 10^5 pfus.
13. (Amended) The method of claim 11, wherein said [therapeutically effective] dose is about 10^6 pfus.
14. (Amended) The method of claim 11, wherein said [therapeutically effective] dose is about 10^7 pfus.
15. (Amended) The method of claim 11, wherein said [therapeutically effective] dose is about 10^8 pfus.
16. (Amended) The method of claim 1, wherein said [therapeutically effective dose of] attenuated measles virus is provided in a composition further comprising [said attenuated measles virus, an] attenuated mumps virus[,] and [an] attenuated rubella virus.
17. (Amended) The method of claim 1, wherein said [therapeutically effective dose of] attenuated measles virus is provided in a composition further comprising [said attenuated measles virus and an] attenuated rubella virus.
18. (Amended) The method of claim 1, wherein said attenuated measles virus is genetically modified to express a marker polypeptide, and wherein [the] expression of said marker polypeptide correlates with [the] replication of said attenuated measles virus.

20. (Amended) The method of claim 1, wherein said cancer cells are selected from the group consisting of melanoma cells, carcinoma cells, glioma cells, and myeloma cells[, and combinations thereof].

21. (Amended) The method of claim 20, [19] wherein said cancer cells are myeloma cells [are lymphoma cells].

22. (Amended) The method of claim 21, wherein said myeloma [lymphoma] cells are Non-Hodgkin's Lymphoma cells.

28. (Amended) The method of claim 1, wherein said attenuated virus is selected from the group consisting of the Edmonston Zagreb measles strain, the Edmonston-Enders strain [stain], the Moraten strain, and the Moraten Berna strain.

29. (Amended) The method of claim 1, wherein said attenuated virus comprises a strain obtained after serial passage of either the [a] Moraten strain or the Moraten Berna strain on non-human cells.

30. (Amended) The method of claim 1, wherein said attenuated virus comprises a strain obtained after serial passage of the [a] Edmonston strain, the Edmonston Zagreb strain, or the Edmonston Enders strain on non-human cells.